



June 2007

## California Postsecondary Education Commission

# Faculty Salaries at California's Public Universities, 2007-08

*Based on five-year trend projections, faculty salaries at the California State University and the University of California will lag salaries at comparable institutions.*

## Contents

Methodology .....	1
Faculty Salary Trends .....	3
Parity Figures for 2007-08 .....	4
Implications .....	11

The Commission advises the Governor and the Legislature on higher education policy and fiscal issues. Its primary focus is to ensure that the State's educational resources are used effectively to provide Californians with postsecondary education opportunities. More information about the Commission is available at [www.cpec.ca.gov](http://www.cpec.ca.gov).

Draft Commission Report

To prepare this report, the Commission examined faculty salary data supplied by the University of California (UC) and the California State University (CSU) systems. This report compares faculty salaries at California's public universities with faculty salaries at comparable institutions of higher education.

## Methodology

The methodology used to collect data and to make comparisons was adopted several years ago after extensive consultation with an advisory committee appointed by the Commission. The advisory committee included representatives from the California State University, the University of California, the Department of Finance, and the Legislative Analyst's Office. The California Faculty Association also participated as an observer on the Advisory Committee. Thus the methodology used to prepare this report reflects input from major stakeholders concerned with faculty salaries at California's public universities.

The methodology used to prepare faculty salary studies has two primary steps: (1) the UC and CSU report salary data to the Commission; and (2) CPEC applies a formula that weights comparative salary data to derive a salary parity measure based on similar higher education institutions.

Because of the differences between the UC and CSU systems, separate comparison groups and weights are used. Display 1 shows the comparison institutions for the two university systems. The institutions selected for comparison were based on input provided by the Commission's advisory committee.

The computational process includes a determination of current average salaries, by rank, in both California systems and the comparison institutions, with each rank's average projected forward one year based on the previous five-year growth rate. The projected 2007-08 average rank-by-rank salaries for the comparison institutions are then compared to the current-year CSU and UC averages. These averages are then combined into an "All-Ranks Average" for each comparison group and each California system and compared for the current and budget years. Comparing the projected average for the comparison group next year with the current-year average for the California systems produces the budget-year "parity figure."

### DISPLAY 1 Comparison Institutions

#### The California State University

##### Northeast Region

Bucknell University\*  
Rutgers, the State University  
of New Jersey, Newark  
State University of New York,  
Albany  
Tufts University\*  
University of Connecticut

##### Southern Region

Georgia State University  
George Mason University  
North Carolina State University  
University of Maryland,  
Baltimore County

##### North Central Region

Cleveland State University  
Illinois State University  
Loyola University, Chicago\*  
Wayne State University  
University of Wisconsin,  
Milwaukee

##### Western Region

Arizona State University  
Reed College\*  
University of Colorado, Denver  
University of Nevada, Reno  
University of Southern California\*  
University of Texas, Arlington

#### The University of California

Harvard University\*  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology\*  
Stanford University\*  
State University of New York, Buffalo  
University of Illinois, Urbana  
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor  
University of Virginia, Charlottesville  
Yale University\*

\* Independent Institution.

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

## Faculty Salary Trends

Display 2 shows the salary parity computations for the two public university systems, plus the actual salary increases granted, since the 1981-82 fiscal year.

During the first half of the 1980s, the parity figure between the CSU and its comparison group was consistently smaller than the comparable figure for the UC and its group. However, by the late 1980s, this situation had reversed. During the recession in the early 1990s, few faculty salary increases were funded in the State's budget. This worsened the compensation deficiency between faculty at California's public institutions and their comparison groups creating the largest compensation disparity since the inflationary era of the 1970s and early 1980s.

As the economy moved from recession to economic boom in the mid 1990s, the availability of increased state revenues allowed California to provide for more competitive salary adjustments. As a result, the parity gap at the State's universities diminished significantly.

However, the parity gap again began to increase as the State's economy slipped into recession following the "dot com" stock market decline in 2001. Smaller faculty salary increases have contributed to evidence of a growing salary parity gap with comparator institutions in recent years. For fiscal year 2007-08, a parity gap of 19.1% for the CSU system is projected, up from the 18% estimated for the current fiscal year. The UC parity gap is projected to be 14.5% in the current fiscal year compared to an estimated 13.9% in fiscal year 2007-08.

<b>DISPLAY 2 Faculty Salary Parity Figures and Actual Increases</b>				
<u>Year</u>	The California State University		University of California	
	<u>Parity Figure</u>	<u>Salary Increase</u>	<u>Parity Figure</u>	<u>Salary Increase</u>
1981-82	0.5%	6.0%	5.8%	6.0%
1982-83	2.3	0.0	9.8	0.0
1983-84	9.2	6.0	18.5	7.0
1984-85	7.6	10.0	10.6	9.0
1985-86	N/A	10.5	6.5	9.5
1986-87	6.9	6.8	1.4	5.0
1987-88	6.9	6.9	2.0	5.6
1988-89	4.7	4.7	3.0	3.0
1989-90	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
1990-91	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8
1991-92	4.1	0.0	3.5	0.0
1992-93	6.0	0.0	6.7	0.0
1993-94	8.5	3.0	6.5	0.0
1994-95	6.8	0.0	12.6	3.0
1995-96	12.7	2.5	10.4	3.0
1996-97	9.6	4.0	10.3	5.0
1997-98	10.8	4.0	6.7	5.0
1998-99	11.2	5.7	4.6	4.5
1999-00	11.1	6.0	2.9	2.9
2000-01	8.9	6.0	3.0	3.0
2001-02	7.9	3.2	3.9	0.5
2002-03	10.6	3.0	6.9	0.5
2003-04	11.6	0.8	9.2	0.0
2004-05	12.7	0.0	9.3	0.0
2005-06	16.8	3.5	13.9	2.0
2006-07	18.00%	4.0	14.50%	2.0
2007-08	19.1%		13.9%	

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

It is important to understand that these parity gaps are projections and may not accurately reflect the salary competitiveness of California's public universities. For example, when the Commission projects a fiscal year 2007-08 difference of 19.1% for CSU faculty, it does not mean that faculty will actually be paid that percent less than their colleagues at comparable institutions. The parity number assumes future (2007-08) salary increases at the comparison institutions based on observed trends over a five-year period. The projected and actual variances in salaries can differ significantly based on the actual amount of salary increase that comparison institutions pay. Further, salary increases provided to faculty at the CSU and UC alter the disparity between California institutions and comparators.

## The Parity Figures for 2007-08

### California State University

Display 3 shows the parity calculations for the California State University for fiscal years (2006-07) and (2007-08).

The “parity figure” for the CSU system for 2007-08 is 19.1%—the estimated percentage by which average salaries in the CSU would have to increase to equal the average salaries projected to be paid by comparison institutions in 2007-08. These calculations are based upon data for 20 comparison institutions. It should also be noted that the 2006-07 CSU salaries were based on an estimated 4% increase above previous salaries from October 2006 in order to account for negotiations with the California Faculty Association. Additionally, a faculty salary adjustment negotiated for 2007-08 should further mitigate the salary parity gap projected in this report.

Displays 4 and 5 show rank-by-rank and institution-by-institution salary comparisons for 2001-02 and 2006-07. These data are used to determine the five-year compounded average growth rate that permits salaries to be projected into the budget year. The shaded lines in both displays indicate the estimated CSU position in regard to individual faculty groupings and for the faculty salary average. Based on the data for the 2001-02 and the 2006-07 periods, the CSU dropped from 12<sup>th</sup> to the 16<sup>th</sup> position in faculty salary average rankings with similar institutions.

Displayed by level, faculty at the professor level dropped from 15<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> in its ranking, while the associate professor level fell from 11<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup>, the assistant professor level fell from 12<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup>, and the instructor level fell from 10<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup>.

DISPLAY 3 California State University Comparison Group Average Salaries, 2001-02 and 2006-07; Compound Rates of Increase, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, 2007-08; and Projected CSU Faculty Salary Percentage Increase Required to Attain Parity with the Comparison Group in 2007-08

	Comparison Group Average Salaries	Comparison Group Average Salaries		Comparison Group Projected Salaries	
<u>Academic Rank</u>	<u>2001-02<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>2006-07<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>Compound Rate of Increase</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	
Professor	\$92,424	\$110,313	3.6%	\$114,287	
Associate Professor	\$66,729	\$77,761	3.1%	\$80,177	
Assistant Professor	\$55,338	\$65,460	3.4%	\$67,696	
Instructor	\$40,243	\$45,122	2.3%	\$46,167	
	California State University Actual Average Salaries	Comparison Group Average Salaries		Percentage Increase Required in California State University Average Salaries to Equal the Comparison Institution Average	
<u>Academic Rank</u>	<u>2006-07<sup>3</sup></u>	<u>Actual 2006-07</u>	<u>Projected 2007-08</u>	<u>Actual 2006-07</u>	<u>Projected 2007-08</u>
Professor	\$89,421	\$110,313	\$114,287	23.4%	27.8%
Associate Professor	\$70,194	\$77,761	\$80,177	10.8%	14.2%
Assistant Professor	\$60,186	\$65,460	\$67,696	8.8%	12.5%
Instructor	\$44,132	\$45,122	\$46,167	2.2%	4.6%
Weighted by State University Staffing	\$73,440	\$85,291	\$88,210	16.1%	20.1%
Weighted by Comparison Institution Staffing	\$72,864	\$84,180	\$87,027	15.5%	19.4%
<i>All Ranks Average and Net Percentage Amount<sup>2</sup></i>	\$73,296	\$84,458	\$87,323	<b>15.2%</b>	<b>19.1%</b>
<b>Institutional Current-Year Staffing Pattern</b>					
<u>(Headcount Faculty)</u>	<u>Professor</u>	<u>Associate Professor</u>	<u>Assistant Professor</u>	<u>Instructor</u>	<u>Total</u>
California State University	4,649	2,648	3,803	522	11,622
<i>Percent</i>	<i>40.0%</i>	<i>22.8%</i>	<i>32.7%</i>	<i>4.5%</i>	
Comparison Institutions	5,032	4,455	3,911	760	14,158
<i>Percent</i>	<i>35.5%</i>	<i>31.5%</i>	<i>27.6%</i>	<i>5.4%</i>	

1. Weighted 58% high-cost institutions, 42% low-cost institutions.

2. "All-Ranks Average" salaries are derived by weighting the California State University and Comparison Institutions by 75% of their own staffing pattern and 25% of the comparison institution's staffing pattern.

3. CSU Salaries Estimated at 4% above October 2006 averages salaries at each rank.

Source: CPEC staff analysis.

# California Postsecondary Education Commission

DISPLAY 4 California State University Comparison Institution Salary Data, by Rank, 2001-02

Institution	<u>Professors</u>			<u>Associate Professors</u>			<u>Assistant Professors</u>			<u>Instructors</u>			<u>Weighted Ave. Salary</u>		
	No.	Average Salary (rank)		No.	Average Salary (rank)		No.	Average Salary (rank)		No.	Average Salary (rank)		Total		(rank)
Institution Q <sup>1</sup>	519	106,255	(2)	324	74,409	(3)	244	65,453	(1)	31	54,735	(2)	1,118	86,692	(1)
Institution J <sup>1</sup>	133	\$109,148	(1)	119	\$80,885	(1)	90	\$65,247	(2)	31	\$43,616	(5)	373	\$84,092	(2)
Institution B <sup>1</sup>	434	100,755	(4)	352	74,641	(2)	255	58,974	(3)	17	60,584	(1)	1,058	81,351	(3)
Institution P <sup>1</sup>	128	95,259	(6)	119	69,999	(4)	59	53,644	(11)	0	0	--	306	77,412	(4)
Institution K	479	92,450	(7)	342	67,578	(6)	257	57,453	(4)	15	42,586	(6)	1,093	75,754	(5)
Institution N	216	90,876	(9)	180	64,751	(12)	109	55,008	(7)	0	0	--	505	73,822	(6)
Institution S <sup>1</sup>	282	89,310	(11)	252	68,718	(5)	206	54,816	(8)	34	48,469	(4)	774	71,631	(7)
Institution M <sup>1</sup>	170	90,442	(10)	135	65,918	(10)	112	52,179	(15)	10	40,017	(12)	427	71,471	(8)
Institution A	618	87,590	(12)	416	62,816	(14)	295	54,432	(9)	46	38,181	(13)	1,375	71,328	(9)
Institution R <sup>1</sup>	245	97,421	(5)	264	67,418	(7)	210	50,906	(18)	91	41,653	(8)	810	69,318	(10)
Institution I <sup>1</sup>	126	91,647	(8)	116	64,323	(13)	122	55,271	(6)	23	40,812	(9)	387	68,968	(11)
<b>CSU</b>	<b>5,743</b>	<b>\$81,467</b>	<b>(15)</b>	<b>1,991</b>	<b>\$65,799</b>	<b>(11)</b>	<b>3,081</b>	<b>\$52,549</b>	<b>(12)</b>	<b>558</b>	<b>\$40,749</b>	<b>(10)</b>	<b>11,373</b>	<b>\$68,892</b>	<b>(12)</b>
Institution F	179	104,806	(3)	287	66,682	(8)	303	55,282	(5)	114	35,514	(14)	883	66,475	(13)
Institution T	240	80,576	(18)	264	62,756	(15)	214	54,257	(10)	9	43,561	(7)	727	65,899	(14)
Institution G <sup>1</sup>	157	81,509	(16)	214	59,273	(19)	71	50,208	(19)	0	0	--	442	65,715	(15)
Institution C	70	86,658	(13)	107	66,376	(9)	110	51,848	(16)	2	49,875	(3)	289	65,645	(16)
Institution L	47	81,333	(17)	28	60,845	(16)	47	50,989	(17)	0	0	--	122	64,941	(17)
Institution O	194	78,054	(19)	166	57,414	(20)	122	52,351	(14)	0	0	--	482	64,440	(18)
Institution D	151	75,043	(20)	189	58,519	(18)	114	45,087	(21)	3	40,516	(11)	457	60,510	(19)
Institution H	249	72,405	(21)	180	56,307	(21)	260	48,725	(20)	0	0	--	689	59,264	(20)
Institution E <sup>1</sup>	111	82,019	(14)	114	60,577	(17)	95	53,286	(13)	109	34,821	(15)	429	57,966	(21)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4,748</b>	<b>\$91,406</b>		<b>4,168</b>	<b>\$66,108</b>		<b>3,295</b>	<b>\$54,846</b>		<b>535</b>	<b>\$40,577</b>		<b>12,746</b>	<b>\$71,549</b>	
<b>High cost 10</b>	<b>2,305</b>	<b>\$96,946</b>		<b>2,009</b>	<b>\$69,389</b>		<b>1,464</b>	<b>\$56,860</b>		<b>346</b>	<b>\$42,345</b>		<b>6,124</b>	<b>\$75,238</b>	
<b>Low cost 10</b>	<b>2,443</b>	<b>86,178</b>		<b>2,159</b>	<b>63,055</b>		<b>1,831</b>	<b>53,236</b>		<b>189</b>	<b>37,339</b>		<b>6,622</b>	<b>68,137</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,748</b>	<b>\$92,424</b>		<b>4,168</b>	<b>\$66,729</b>		<b>3,295</b>	<b>\$55,338</b>		<b>535</b>	<b>\$40,243</b>		<b>12,746</b>	<b>\$72,256</b>	

1. Universities located in higher cost areas.

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor.

DISPLAY 5 California State University Comparison Institution Salary Data, by Rank, 2006-07

Institution	<u>Professors</u>			<u>Associate Professors</u>			<u>Assistant Professors</u>			<u>Instructors</u>			<u>Weighted Ave.</u>		
	No.	Average Salary (rank)		No.	Average Salary (rank)		No.	Average Salary (rank)		No.	Average Salary (rank)		Total	Average Salary (rank)	
Institution Q <sup>1</sup>	595	131,425	(1)	360	91,910	(1)	273	81,096	(1)	39	48,715	(9)	1,267	106,807	(1)
Institution P <sup>1</sup>	147	117,469	(5)	123	86,923	(3)	68	70,227	(3)	0	0	--	338	96,849	(2)
Institution J <sup>1</sup>	131	\$122,459	(2)	94	\$87,185	(2)	72	\$76,306	(2)	47	\$45,748	(10)	344	\$92,679	(3)
Institution B <sup>1</sup>	422	119,565	(4)	387	84,287	(4)	321	68,892	(4)	55	58,865	(1)	1,185	91,500	(4)
Institution A	621	111,930	(6)	388	75,943	(10)	343	67,690	(5)	81	35,990	(15)	1,433	87,304	(5)
Institution M <sup>1</sup>	198	111,557	(7)	158	82,844	(5)	164	64,152	(10)	14	49,081	(6)	534	86,865	(6)
Institution K	631	103,885	(12)	417	77,432	(8)	336	66,263	(6)	4	55,917	(3)	1,388	86,692	(7)
Institution R <sup>1</sup>	286	120,935	(3)	320	81,087	(6)	324	64,452	(9)	87	52,243	(5)	1,017	84,526	(8)
Institution N	218	106,060	(10)	193	75,883	(11)	175	62,317	(12)	0	0	--	586	83,058	(9)
Institution C	70	109,145	(8)	121	79,521	(7)	110	66,023	(7)	0	0	--	301	81,477	(10)
Institution S <sup>1</sup>	284	100,978	(13)	252	77,288	(9)	256	63,324	(11)	28	56,365	(2)	820	80,419	(11)
Institution I <sup>1</sup>	140	104,259	(11)	135	73,592	(13)	135	61,931	(13)	17	49,052	(7)	427	78,983	(12)
Institution L	62	94,022	(17)	33	69,033	(17)	31	58,593	(18)	0	0	--	126	78,761	(13)
Institution G <sup>1</sup>	157	100,538	(14)	185	74,997	(12)	51	59,408	(17)	93	52,875	(4)	486	77,379	(14)
Institution O	180	94,467	(16)	167	70,799	(15)	194	65,322	(8)	0	0	--	541	76,710	(15)
<b>CSU</b>	<b>4,649</b>	<b>\$89,421</b>	<b>(18)</b>	<b>2,648</b>	<b>\$70,194</b>	<b>(16)</b>	<b>3,803</b>	<b>\$60,186</b>	<b>(15)</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>\$44,132</b>	<b>(11)</b>	<b>11,622</b>	<b>\$73,440</b>	<b>(16)</b>
Institution F	197	109,077	(9)	298	68,326	(18)	313	60,097	(16)	96	42,168	(13)	904	71,579	(17)
Institution T	209	88,947	(19)	284	67,830	(19)	297	58,018	(19)	8	49,039	(8)	798	69,520	(18)
Institution D	145	87,375	(20)	195	64,016	(20)	144	52,737	(21)	6	43,863	(12)	490	67,367	(19)
Institution H	240	80,407	(21)	223	61,514	(21)	228	57,041	(20)	0	0	--	691	66,600	(20)
Institution E <sup>1</sup>	99	96,703	(15)	122	71,881	(14)	76	60,890	(14)	185	41,357	(14)	482	63,531	(21)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>5,032</b>	<b>\$108,897</b>		<b>4,455</b>	<b>\$76,686</b>		<b>3,911</b>	<b>\$64,673</b>		<b>760</b>	<b>\$46,504</b>		<b>14,158</b>	<b>\$83,196</b>	
<b>High cost 10</b>	<b>2,459</b>	<b>\$116,825</b>		<b>2,136</b>	<b>\$82,250</b>		<b>1,740</b>	<b>\$67,905</b>		<b>565</b>	<b>\$48,673</b>		<b>6,900</b>	<b>\$88,205</b>	
<b>Low cost 10</b>	<b>2,573</b>	<b>101,321</b>		<b>2,319</b>	<b>71,561</b>		<b>2,171</b>	<b>62,082</b>		<b>195</b>	<b>40,218</b>		<b>7,258</b>	<b>78,434</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,032</b>	<b>\$110,313</b>		<b>4,455</b>	<b>\$77,761</b>		<b>3,911</b>	<b>\$65,460</b>		<b>760</b>	<b>\$45,122</b>		<b>14,158</b>	<b>\$84,101</b>	

1. Universities located in higher cost areas.

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor.

### **University of California**

The UC provided the Commission with actual data from six of the eight University of California comparison institutions. The UC estimated salary data for two other institutions.

Display 6 shows the parity projections for the UC for both the current and budget years. For the UC system, the methodology indicates a “parity figure” of 13.9%, which is the percentage amount by which UC faculty are estimated to lag their counterparts if no salary increase is granted for 2007-08.

Display 7 presents a comparison of 2001-02 and 2006-07 institution data. The data indicates better salaries at the private comparison institutions than at the UC, but that overall the UC’s total average faculty salary rate is higher than other public comparison institutions. The data also indicate that UC’s salary levels have lost ground relative to private comparison institutions and higher salary public comparison institutions. The UC’s “total faculty” average is at the median 5<sup>th</sup> among comparison institutions, with full professor salary levels ranked 6<sup>th</sup>, associate professor levels ranked 7<sup>th</sup>, and assistant professor levels ranked 5<sup>th</sup>.



DISPLAY 6 University of California Comparison Group Average Salaries, 2001-02 and 2006-07; Compound Rates of Increase, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, 2007-08; and Projected Percentage UC Faculty Salary Increase Required to Attain Parity with the Comparison Group in 2007-08

Comparison Group			Compound Rate of Increase	Comparison Group	
Academic Rank	2001-02 <sup>1</sup>	2006-07 <sup>1</sup>		Projected Salaries, 2007-08	
Professor	\$115,759	\$140,484	3.9%	\$146,030	
Associate Professor	\$77,776	\$93,390	3.7%	\$96,871	
Assistant Professor	\$65,047	\$78,896	3.9%	\$82,002	
			Percent Increase Required in University Ave. Salaries to Equal the Comparison Institution		
	University of Calif. Average	Comparison Group		Average	
Academic Rank	Salaries, 2006-07	Actual 2006-07	Projected 2007-08	Actual 2006-07	Projected 2007-08
Professor	\$125,096	\$140,484	\$146,030	12.3%	16.7%
Associate Professor	\$81,696	\$93,390	\$96,871	14.3%	18.6%
Assistant Professor	\$72,876	\$78,896	\$82,002	8.3%	12.5%
Weighted by University of California Staffing	\$105,711	\$118,424	\$123,057	12.0%	16.4%
Weighted by Comparison Institution Staffing	\$101,343	\$113,408	\$117,836	11.9%	16.3%
All Ranks Average/Net Percentage Amount <sup>2</sup>	\$104,619	\$114,662	\$119,141	9.6%	13.9%
Institutional Budget-Year Staffing Pattern, (Full- Time-Equivalent Faculty)			Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Total
University of California		Professor	1,332.8	1,416.0	6,798.5
Percent		59.6%	19.6%	20.8%	100.0%
Comparison Institutions		4,412.3	1,998.3	2,302.5	8,713.1
Percent		50.6%	22.9%	26.4%	100.0%

1. Weighted 50% public comparison institutions, 50% independent comparison institutions. The University of California Office of the President reports that it has final survey results from seven of its eight comparison institutions and has estimated final results for the eighth institution.

2. All-Ranks Average derived by weighting University of California and comparison institutions by 75% of their own staffing pattern and 25% of the other's staffing pattern.

Source: CPEC staff analysis.

# California Postsecondary Education Commission

DISPLAY 7 University of California Comparison Institution Average Salaries and Ranking, 2001-02 and 2006-07

<u>2001-02</u>	Type <sup>1</sup>	<u>Professor</u>			<u>Associate Professor</u>			<u>Assistant Professor</u>			<u>Total Faculty</u>		
		Number	Salary	Rank	Number	Salary	Rank	Number	Salary	Rank	Number	Salary	Rank
Institution H	I	681	\$139,187	1	105	\$86,651	2	251	\$74,567	2	1,037	\$118,227	1
Institution A	I	504	\$124,860	2	133	\$91,529	1	215	\$71,578	3	852	\$106,212	2
Institution F	I	552	\$123,986	3	177	\$82,276	3	183	\$75,660	1	912	\$106,194	3
Institution D	I	402	\$123,635	4	72	\$73,967	5	193	\$60,685	6	667	\$100,059	4
<b>Univ. of Calif.</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>3,867</b>	<b>\$109,680</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1,249</b>	<b>\$71,992</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1,027</b>	<b>\$64,221</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6,143</b>	<b>\$94,417</b>	<b>5</b>
Institution E	P	702	\$108,713	6	327	\$76,480	4	390	\$61,653	5	1,419	\$88,351	6
Institution B	P	461	\$101,924	7	253	\$70,044	7	230	\$57,624	8	944	\$82,593	7
Institution G	P	821	\$99,414	8	453	\$69,414	8	482	\$59,128	7	1,757	\$80,615	8
Institution C	P	297	\$97,653	9	224	\$67,481	9	193	\$56,527	9	714	\$77,071	9
<b>Totals</b>		<b>4,420.5</b>	<b>\$115,759</b>		<b>1,744.3</b>	<b>\$77,776</b>		<b>2,137.2</b>	<b>\$65,047</b>		<b>8,302.1</b>	<b>\$95,682</b>	

  

<u>2006-07</u>	Type <sup>1</sup>	<u>Professor</u>			<u>Associate Professor</u>			<u>Assistant Professor</u>			<u>Total Faculty</u>		
		Number	Salary	Rank	Number	Salary	Rank	Number	Salary	Rank	Number	Salary	Rank
Institution H	I	664	\$170,883	1	134	\$101,350	3	227	\$92,288	1	1,025	\$144,387	1
Institution A	I	507	\$160,685	2	143	\$113,841	1	200	\$90,638	3	850	\$136,323	2
Institution F <sup>2</sup>	I	505	\$153,140	3	147	\$103,219	2	175	\$91,276	2	827	\$131,175	3
Institution D <sup>2</sup>	I	407	\$145,932	4	68	\$89,681	4	199	\$72,335	7	674	\$118,527	4
<b>Univ. of Calif.</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>4,050</b>	<b>\$125,096</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1,333</b>	<b>\$81,696</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1,416</b>	<b>\$72,876</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6,798</b>	<b>\$105,711</b>	<b>5</b>
Institution E	P	756	\$127,850	5	421	\$86,289	6	402	\$73,655	4	1,579	\$102,971	6
Institution B	P	446	\$122,204	7	283	\$86,641	5	242	\$72,643	6	971	\$99,487	7
Institution G	P	776	\$118,091	8	502	\$78,964	9	503	\$71,376	8	1,781	\$93,877	8
Institution C	P	351	\$116,089	9	300	\$80,977	8	355	\$66,742	9	1,006	\$88,205	9
<b>Totals</b>		<b>4,412.3</b>	<b>\$140,484</b>		<b>1,998.3</b>	<b>\$93,390</b>		<b>2,302.5</b>	<b>\$78,896</b>		<b>8,713.1</b>	<b>\$115,238</b>	

1. I =Independent; P = Public.  
2. Estimated data.  
Source: University of California, Office of the President.

## Implications

The Commission believes faculty salaries should be adequate to attract and retain competent and qualified university personnel.

Salaries are only one factor determining the ability of universities to attract and retain the faculty they need. Factors such as retirement and healthcare benefits, job security, housing costs, and the quality of life in the communities where campuses are located are other factors that influence employment decisions. The Commission's parity calculations for the University of California and California State University provide only one measure of institutional competitiveness for employing and retaining faculty.

Alone, salary parity data provide limited insight into the added value that increasing faculty compensation provides. The Commission believes other data need to be considered. For example, personnel turnover rates and data measuring how long faculty positions remain vacant are useful for determining if compensation levels are adequate to attract qualified candidates and retain valuable personnel. Similarly, the prestige of educational institutions and campus location also impact the attractiveness of holding a faculty position and the salary needed to attract and retain educators. The Commission urges State policymakers to carefully consider these and other factors such as sabbaticals, housing allowances, and bonuses in devising an appropriate strategy for setting compensation.

Lastly, in order for the Commission to obtain the authority and resources necessary to conduct a comprehensive review and identify the best strategies the State should adopt to guide compensation decisions, staff recommends that the Commission reaffirm the following resolution:

*The Commission recommends that lawmakers and university administrators take a comprehensive approach to faculty salaries based on a well-reasoned human resource strategy that best fits the needs of public universities. The Commission also recommends that compensation policy-making be highly transparent and well-justified.*

*In recognition of the inability of current faculty and executive compensation reports to accurately reflect total compensation at California's public segments of higher education and at the recommendation of the Commission's Executive Director, the Commission supports all efforts to obtain the necessary authority and resources to undertake a comprehensive review of compensation policies within California higher education. The purpose of the review is to provide transparency and accountability in the compensation process.*

*The review must take into account the competitive market place for recruitment and retention of outstanding faculty. The review should be undertaken with the consultation and cooperation of an appropriate advisory committee that should include, but not be limited to, representatives of the public segments.*

